

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the final Office Action of December 18, 2008 in which claims 1-20 were rejected.

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that *Hong* and *Hively* would anticipate current claims 1, 8, 15 and 16. Neither *Hong* nor *Hively* disclose ESD shielding that is carried out using an electroconductive element as currently claimed.

The electroconductive element according to the claimed invention will conduct electricity in any state of the element, independent of voltage it is exposed to. In other words the electroconductive element is capable of conducting electricity continuously. This is implicitly evident from the original description on page 4, lines 4-6 and 12-16, citing that the electroconductive element can be made of metal and that it conducts electrostatic (current, voltage) pulses to the ground. As would be known to any person of skill in the art this kind of electroconductive element, i.e. metal as electroconductive connection material, is a so called ohmic electroinductive element which means that the resistance of the connection is independent of voltage. Also *Hong* cites in column 2, lines 28-29, "ohmic metal line."

Contrary to this *Hong* discloses ESD shielding provided by the non-ohmic material element (106) which acts as an insulator below a specific voltage and a conductor in voltage more than the specific voltage (*Hong* column 3, lines 3-8). *Hong* also cites that the resistance of the connection of the non-ohmic element depends on current and voltage (*Hong* column 4, lines 5-10). This kind of element is not an electroconductive element as disclosed in the present application, since it can also be an insulator element as well, and therefore in *Hong* the non-ohmic material element is called a discharging element (col. 2, lines 10-13). Therefore, claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are new over *Hong*.

Hively discloses ESD shielding provided by the protection layer (122) made of polymer or other suitable material which is normally an insulator but is rendered temporarily conductive by a high applied electrostatic potential (*Hively* column 3, lines 45-49). Once again the protection element is the non-ohmic material element which acts as an insulator or a conductor depending on the electrostatic potential (*Hively* column 2, lines 20-23), which means that the resistance of the connection of

the non-ohmic protection element depends on current and voltage. This kind of element is not an electroconductive element as disclosed in the present application, since it can also be an insulator element as well. Therefore, claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are new over *Hively*.

With regard to section 1 of the Office Action claims 8 and 13 are objected to. The wording of claims 8 and 13 have been amended to correspond the wording of claims 1 and 6 in order to overcome the objection and withdrawal thereof is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of December 18, 2008, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-20 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234